

**FAX ONLY****RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 26 2005****26 SET. 2005**

Messrs.
Arent Fox Kintner Plotkin
& Kahn PLLC
1015 Connecticut Avenue
N.W. Suite 600
WASHINGTON D.C. 200036-5539
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Re: U.S. Patent Appln. S. N. 09/592,254
TURRI et al.
Our Case: AF 2081 CONT/031/USA pls. note our new ref.
Your Ref.: 108910-00009

Dear Sirs,

This will refer to the Office Action dated July 28 2005
enclosed with your letter of August 15 2005.

Claim rejections under 35 USC § 112

Claim 17

Please amend the expression : "containing an alkylic chain
from 1 to 8 carbon atoms", into : "with an alkylic chain from
1 to 8 carbon atoms".

Claim 36

Please amend the expression : "... are of the $\text{HO}(\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{O})_{x0}\text{CH}_2-$
type..." into: "... have formula $\text{HO}(\text{CH}_2\text{CH}_2\text{O})_{x0}\text{CH}_2- \dots$ ".

Claim 38

We propose to amend the expression: "... said
(per) fluoropolyethers comprise one or more (per) fluorooxyalkylene
units..." into : "... said (per) fluoropolyethers having one or
more (per) fluorooxyalkylene units...".

Claim 40

In substitution of the objected sentence "Q can optionally
contain..." we propose "Q can optionally include a substituent
selected from heteroatoms.... carbonylimino, sulphonylimino or
carbonylic groups"

About the formula (e'), see page 5 of the O.A., the Examiner
is right. See page 11 of the Specification. Therefore the double
bond between Q and OH should be substituted by a simple bond.

Double patenting rejection

We have noted that the claims have been rejected, see page
6, lines 1-3 of the O.A., under the judicially created doctrine
of obviousness-type double patenting rejection over US patent No.
6,579,835.

This patent is therefore considered by the Examiner a prior

SAMA PATENTS del Dr. Daniele Sama - Via G. B. Morgagni, 2 - 20129 Milano (Italy)
Phone: +39 02.29521908 / 29526908 - Fax +39 02.29521926
Cod. Fisc. SMA DNL 48S14 C553V - Partita I.V.A. 10441370151 - C.C.I.A.A. MI 1372253

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

This patent is therefore considered by the Examiner a prior art document. This is confirmed by the Examiner's comments at bottom of page 9 of the O.A.

We remark that the priority of the USP is June 8, 2000 and that the priority of the present Application is June 11, 1999.

Therefore according to our opinion USP 6,579,835 should not be cited as prior art of the present Application, since the USP was filed almost one year later than the present Application.

In conclusion, we think that no terminal disclaimer should be requested in this case.

Please let us know.

Please let us have the following documents:

- Exparte Muench 79 USPQ 92, cited at page 3 of the O.A.
- In re Goodmann, In re Longi, In re Van Ornum, In re Vogel, In re Thoringtom, all cited at the bottom of page 5 of the O.A.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

SAMA PATENTS

(Daniele Sama)

